Complete Summary

GUIDELINE TITLE

Guidelines for the performance of fusion procedures for degenerative disease of the lumbar spine. Part 17: bone growth stimulators and lumbar fusion.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Resnick DK, Choudhri TF, Dailey AT, Groff MW, Khoo L, Matz PG, Mummaneni P, Watters WC 3rd, Wang J, Walters BC, Hadley MN, American Association of Neurological Surgeons/Congress of Neurological Surgeons. Guidelines for the performance of fusion procedures for degenerative disease of the lumbar spine. Part 17: bone growth stimulators and lumbar fusion. J Neurosurg Spine 2005 Jun;2(6):737-40. [18 references] PubMed

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE

DISEASE/CONDITION(S)

Degenerative disease of the lumbar spine

GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Management
Technology Assessment
Treatment

CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Internal Medicine
Neurological Surgery
Orthopedic Surgery

INTENDED USERS

Health Plans
Managed Care Organizations
Physicians

GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)

To review the evidence for the efficacy of bone growth stimulators as adjuncts for bone fusion following lumbar surgery

TARGET POPULATION

Patients with degenerative disease of the lumbar spine undergoing lumbar fusion

INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED

1. Direct current stimulation (DCS) or capasitative coupled stimulation (CCS) as an adjunct to spinal fusion
2. Pulsed electromagnetic field stimulation (PEMFS) as an adjunct to spinal fusion

MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED

Effectiveness of bone growth stimulators in terms of fusion rate

METHODOLOGY

METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE

Hand-searches of Published Literature (Primary Sources)
Hand-searches of Published Literature (Secondary Sources)
Searches of Electronic Databases

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE

A computerized search of the database of the National Library of Medicine from 1966 through May 2003 was performed using the key terms "bone stimulator and spine and human and English language," or "electrical stimulation and spinal fusion and human," or "electrical stimulation and pseudarthrosis and spinal fusion." A total of 127 papers were identified. After discarding duplicates and reviewing the abstracts of each paper, eight clinical studies were identified that compared fusion rates between groups of patients treated with or without stimulation. A number of review papers, technical notes, and animal studies served as supporting data. The bibliography of each paper was reviewed and other relevant studies were identified. All peer-reviewed clinical studies regarding

the use of electrical stimulation (ES) to promote healing after lumbar spinal fusion are summarized in Table 1 in the original guideline document. Several reviews, meta-analyses, and chapters are referenced in the original guideline as background material.

NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS

9 peer-reviewed clinical studies regarding the use of electrical stimulation (ES) to promote healing after lumbar spinal fusion are summarized in Table 1 in the original guideline document.

METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Classes of Evidence

Class I Evidence from one or more well-designed, randomized controlled clinical trials, including overviews of such trials

Class II Evidence from one or more well-designed comparative clinical studies, such as nonrandomized cohort studies, case-control studies, and other comparable studies, including less well-designed randomized controlled trials

Class III Evidence from case series, comparative studies with historical controls, case reports, and expert opinion as well as significantly flawed randomized controlled trials

METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Review of Published Meta-Analyses
Systematic Review with Evidence Tables

DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

The group culled through literally thousands of references to identify the most scientifically robust citations available concerning each individual topic. Not every reference identified is cited. In general, if high-quality (Class I or II) medical evidence was available on a particular topic, poorer-quality evidence was only briefly summarized and rarely included in the evidentiary tables. If no high-quality evidence existed, or if there was significant disagreement between similarly classified evidence sources, then the Class III and supporting medical evidence were discussed in greater detail. If multiple reports were available that provided similar information, a few were chosen as illustrative examples.

METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Expert Consensus

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

In January 2003, a group was formed at the request of the leadership of the Congress of Neurological Surgeons (CNS) by the executive committee of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons/CNS Joint Section on Disorders of the Spine and Peripheral Nerves to perform an evidence-based review of the literature on lumbar fusion procedures for degenerative disease of the lumbar spine and to formulate treatment recommendations based on this review. In March 2003, this group was convened. Invitations were extended to approximately 12 orthopedic and neurosurgical spine surgeons active in the Joint Section or in the North American Spine Society to ensure participation of nonneurosurgical spine surgeons. The recommendations that were developed represent the product of the work of the group, with input from the Guidelines Committee of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons/CNS and the Clinical Guidelines Committee of North American Spine Society.

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Grades of Recommendation

Standards Recommendations of the strongest type, based on Class I evidence reflecting a high degree of clinical certainty

Guidelines Recommendations based on Class II evidence reflecting a moderate degree of clinical certainty

Options Recommendations based on Class III evidence reflecting unclear clinical certainty

COST ANALYSIS

Lumbar fusion may be associated with a high short-term cost, especially if instrumentation is placed; however, there appear to be long-term economic benefits associated with lumbar fusion including resumption of employment. To describe the economic impact of lumbar fusion for degenerative disease adequately, it is important to define the patient population treated with fusion and to compare efficacy as well as the costs of other treatment alternatives. Any such analysis should include both short- and long-term costs and benefits.

See "Part 3: assessment of economic outcome" in the "Availability of Companions Documents" field for the complete analysis.

METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

External Peer Review
Internal Peer Review

DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

The committee presents data that have been reviewed by the major organizations representing neurological surgery and orthopedic surgery. The Board of Directors of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons (AANS) and the Congress of Neurological Surgeons (CNS) Executive Committee have reviewed these Lumbar Fusion Guidelines and formally voted their approval. In addition, input and approval was received and greatly appreciated from the AANS/CNS Guidelines committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The grades of recommendations (standards, guidelines, and options) and classes of evidence (I–III) are defined at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

Treatment Standards. There is insufficient evidence to recommend a treatment standard.

Treatment Guidelines. Either direct current stimulation (DCS) or capacitative coupled stimulation (CCS) is recommended as an adjunct to spinal fusion to increase fusion rates in patients who are at high risk for arthrodesis failure following lumbar posterolateral fusion (PLF). Pulsed electromagnetic field stimulation is recommended as an adjunct to increase fusion rates in similar patients treated with lumbar interbody fusion procedures.

Summary

There have been a number of randomized studies supporting the use of electrical stimulation (ES) for the promotion of bone healing following lumbar fusion. All of the published studies have methodological flaws that prevent the studies from providing Class I medical evidence. There is, however, Class II and III evidence to support the use of direct current stimulation or capacitative coupled stimulation for enhancing fusion rates in high-risk patients undergoing lumbar PLF. A beneficial effect on fusion rates in patients not at "high risk" has not been convincingly demonstrated, nor has an effect been shown for these modalities in patients treated with interbody fusion. There is limited evidence both for and against the use of pulsed electromagnetic field stimulation (PEMFS) for enhancing fusion rates following PLF. Class II and III medical evidence supports the use of PEMFS for promoting arthrodesis following interbody fusion. Although some studies have purported to demonstrate functional improvement in some patient subgroups, other studies have not detected differences. All of the reviewed studies are significantly flawed by the use of a four-point patient satisfaction scale as the primary outcome measure. This outcome measure is not validated. Because of the use of this flawed outcome measure and because of the conflicting results reported in the better-designed studies that assess functional outcome, there is no consistent medical evidence to support or refute use of these devices for improving patient outcomes.

Definitions:

Grades of Recommendation

Standards Recommendations of the strongest type, based on Class I evidence reflecting a high degree of clinical certainty

Guidelines Recommendations based on Class II evidence reflecting a moderate degree of clinical certainty

Options Recommendations based on Class III evidence reflecting unclear clinical certainty

Classes of Evidence

Class I Evidence from one or more well-designed, randomized controlled clinical trials, including overviews of such trials

Class II Evidence from one or more well-designed comparative clinical studies, such as nonrandomized cohort studies, case-control studies, and other comparable studies, including less well-designed randomized controlled trials

Class III Evidence from case series, comparative studies with historical controls, case reports, and expert opinion as well as significantly flawed randomized controlled trials

CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)

None provided

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The type of supporting evidence is identified and graded for each recommendation (see "Major Recommendations").

BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Appropriate use of bone growth stimulators for lumbar fusion

POTENTIAL HARMS

Not stated

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

- All of the reviewed studies are significantly flawed by the use of a four-point patient satisfaction scale as the primary outcome measure. This outcome

measure is not validated. Because of the use of this flawed outcome measure and because of the conflicting results reported in the better-designed studies that assess functional outcome, there is no consistent medical evidence to support or refute use of these devices for improving patient outcomes.

- The strength of an evidence-based document is only as strong as the foundation on which it is built. This comprehensive document chronicles the state of scientific information in 2005. Many of the published reviews presented flawed results due to poorly defined outcome measures, inadequate numbers of patients, and comparison of dissimilar treatment groups. These studies of "apples and oranges" gleaned little scientific information; therefore, for the purpose of this review, the authors have discarded Class III studies whenever stronger scientific evidence was available. The result is that most of the published studies on lumbar fusion were not included on this document. When Class I or II scientific evidence was available, standards and guidelines were formulated; however, in most cases, the scientific data were only adequate to support recommendations for treatment options. The aforementioned results do not detract from the importance of this document; rather, the need for the neurosurgical community to design and complete prospective randomized controlled studies to answer the many lingering clinical questions with rigorous scientific power can clearly be seen. As more data continue to be accumulated, revisions of this document will be needed.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

An implementation strategy was not provided.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES

IOM CARE NEED

Getting Better
Living with Illness

IOM DOMAIN

Effectiveness

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Resnick DK, Choudhri TF, Dailey AT, Groff MW, Khoo L, Matz PG, Mummaneni P, Watters WC 3rd, Wang J, Walters BC, Hadley MN, American Association of Neurological Surgeons/Congress of Neurological Surgeons. Guidelines for the performance of fusion procedures for degenerative disease of the lumbar spine.

Part 17: bone growth stimulators and lumbar fusion. J Neurosurg Spine 2005 Jun;2(6):737-40. [18 references] PubMed

ADAPTATION

Not applicable: The guideline was not adapted from another source.

DATE RELEASED

2005 Jun

GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)

American Association of Neurological Surgeons - Medical Specialty Society
Congress of Neurological Surgeons - Professional Association

SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING

This project was funded entirely by a grant from AANS/CNS Section on Disorders of the Spine. No funding was received from any commercial entity to support the production or publication of these guidelines.

GUIDELINE COMMITTEE

Guidelines Committee of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons/Congress of Neurological Surgeons (CNS)

COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE

Primary Authors: Daniel K. Resnick, MD; Tanvir F. Choudhri, MD; Andrew T. Dailey, MD; Michael W. Groff, MD; Larry Khoo, MD; Paul G. Matz, MD; Praveen Mummaneni, MD; William C. Watters III, MD; Jeffery Wang, MD; Beverly C. Walters, MD, MPH; Mark N. Hadley, MD

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Not stated

ENDORSER(S)

North American Spine Society - Medical Specialty Society

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY

Electronic copies: Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the AANS/CNS Joint Section on Disorders of the Spine and Peripheral Nerves Web site.

Print copies: Available from Daniel K. Resnick, M.D., Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Wisconsin Medical School, K4/834 Clinical Science Center, 600 Highland Avenue, Madison, Wisconsin 53792; Email: Resnick@neurosurg.wisc.edu.

AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS

The following are available:

- Introduction to the guidelines for the performance of fusion procedures for degenerative disease of the lumbar spine. 2005 Jun. 1 p. Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the AANS/CNS Joint Section on Disorders of the Spine and Peripheral Nerves Web site.
- Guidelines for the performance of fusion procedures for degenerative disease of the lumbar spine. Part 1: introduction and methodology. 2005 Jun. 2 p. Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the AANS/CNS Joint Section on Disorders of the Spine and Peripheral Nerves Web site.
- Guidelines for the performance of fusion procedures for degenerative disease of the lumbar spine. Part 3: assessment of economic outcome. 2005 Jun. 6 p. Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the AANS/CNS Joint Section on Disorders of the Spine and Peripheral Nerves Web site.

Print copies: Available from Daniel K. Resnick, M.D., Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Wisconsin Medical School, K4/834 Clinical Science Center, 600 Highland Avenue, Madison, Wisconsin 53792; Email: Resnick@neurosurg.wisc.edu.

PATIENT RESOURCES

None available

NGC STATUS

This NGC summary was completed by ECRI on January 8, 2007. The information was verified by the guideline developer on January 29, 2007.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

DISCLAIMER

NGC DISCLAIMER

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC Inclusion Criteria which may be found at http://www.guideline.gov/about/inclusion.aspx .

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI Institute make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI Institute, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for advertising or commercial endorsement purposes.

Readers with questions regarding guideline content are directed to contact the guideline developer.

Date Modified: 9/15/2008